

I applaud her for her motivation and desire to learn and grow.

I wish Nadia the best as she continues her education. I know success will follow her wherever she may go.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK GREEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following resolutions for the RECORD.

Whereas, our National Forests were established in the 1920's for multiple use including soil and water protection, recreation, and timber production, and;

Whereas, harvesting is an integral component of multiple-use management of forest lands, and;

Whereas, it is not in the best interest of sustainable ecosystem management to ban commercial logging on National Forests, and;

Whereas, the health of adjoining private and other public forest lands would be in jeopardy if National Forest lands were allowed to become overstocked and subject to insect and disease infestations, and unnecessary fuel build-up were allowed to create the potential for disastrous wild fires, and;

Whereas, timber harvested on the National Forests is vital to many local and regional economies, including that of Vilas County, and;

Whereas, Whereas, Wisconsin's National Forests are not producing below cost timber sales and are not virgin forests, and;

Whereas, there would be an increase in pressure to harvest County Forest Lands and private lands in the area if harvesting ceases on the National Forests within the state, and;

Whereas, the State Forester of Wisconsin is also opposed to the halting of commercial logging on National Forests.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Vilas County Board of Supervisors is opposed to the National Forest Restoration Act and other legislative proposals which propose halting commercial logging on the National Forests.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor, to Wisconsin's Representatives and Senators in the United States Congress, George Meyer, Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, Gene Francisco, State Forester, the Wisconsin County Forests Association, and the President of the United States.

Respectfully submitted by: Vilas County Forestry, Recreation, & Land Committee.

RESOLUTION No. 14-00

Whereas, the counties of Wisconsin support sound forest management policies, which as-

sure that the National Forests of Wisconsin are available for multiple uses such as recreation, logging, and the protection of wildlife, and

Whereas, when the Federal Government created the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forests, they promised the forests would be made available for multiple uses by the people of Wisconsin and

Whereas, President Clinton and the National Forest Service have recently proposed the Roadless initiative, which would place up to 74,000 acres of the Nicolet and Chequamegon Forests of limits to logging and motorized recreation, and

Whereas, This program, along with other restrictions already placed on the national Forests will have an adverse effect on the economy of the entire state, and

Whereas, the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA), have unanimously passed a resolution stating vehement opposition to the Roadless plan, and

Whereas, the National Forest Service is currently revising its Land and Resource Management Plan, which could place even more restrictions on use and access of the National Forests, and

Whereas, the National Forest Resource Committee, made up of concerned parties from around the Great Lakes Region, led by WCA and including logging companies, recreation enthusiasts, policy makers and others, has been formed to fight against further restrictions on use of the National Forests.

Therefore be it resolved, That the Oconto County Board of supervisors does hereby:

1. Oppose programs such as the Roadless Initiative that place unwanted and unnecessary restrictions on use and access of the National Forests, and

2. Advocate a new Land and Resource Management Plan which would rollback several costly, unnecessary restrictions on National Forest use and access, and

3. Support the efforts of the National Forest Resource Committee in its fight to ensure that such goals are met.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Wisconsin Counties Association, the Governor, the U.S. Congressman who represents Oconto County, and U.S. Senators Russ Feingold and Herb Kohl.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the counties of Wisconsin support sound forest management policies, which assure that the National Forests of Wisconsin are available for multiple uses such as recreation, logging, and the protection of wildlife; and

Whereas, when the Federal Government created the Chequamegon and Nicolet National forests, they promised the forests would be made available for multiple uses by the people of Wisconsin; and

Whereas, President Clinton and the National Forest Service have recently proposed the Roadless Initiative, which would place up to 74,000 acres of the Nicolet and Chequamegon Forests off-limit to logging and motorized recreation; and

Whereas, this program, along with other restrictions already placed on the National Forests, will have an adverse effect on the economy of the entire state; and

Whereas, the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA), have unanimously passed a resolution stating vehement opposition to the Roadless Plan; and

Whereas, the National Forest Service is currently revising its Land and Resource Management Plan, which could place even

more restrictions on use and access of the National Forests; and

Whereas, the National Forest Resource Committee, made up of concerned parties from around the Great Lakes Region, led by WCA and including logging companies, recreation enthusiasts, policy-makers and others, has been formed to fight against further restrictions on use of the National Forests.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Forest County Board of Supervisors does hereby:

1. adamantly oppose programs such as the Roadless Initiative that place unwanted and unnecessary restrictions on use and access of the National Forest use and access; and

2. advocate a new Land and Resources Management Plan which would roll back several costly, unnecessary restrictions on National Forest use and access; and

3. support the efforts of the National Forest Resource Committee in its fight to ensure that such goals are met.

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Wisconsin Counties Association, the Governor, Congressman Mark Green, and U.S. Senators Russ Feingold and Herb Kohl.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United States Forest Service is in the process of developing their Forest Plan Revision with respect to the Ten Year Plan for use of the Nicolet National Forest; and

Whereas, a significant portion of all management alternatives proposed for the national forest land based in Forest County is allocated for research and restrictive use in all of the alternatives of the plan that are presently being developed; and

Whereas, the Forest County economy and recreational activities depend upon use of the national forest; and

Whereas, the proposed Ten Year Plan will result in more land going into restrictive use, non-motorized use, of wilderness areas; and

Whereas, Forest County objects to the allocation of any more land going into such limited uses; and

Whereas, heretofore, when land was purchased from Forest County by the Forest Service, it was represented by said Forest Service that the land to be purchased was to be utilized for timber production as well as other multiple uses. The proposed Ten Year Plan varies considerably from such representations; and

Whereas, Florence County has adopted a similar Resolution objecting to the present revisions of the Nicolet Forest Ten Year Plan; and

Whereas, it is appropriate for the Forest County Board of Supervisors to object to the proposed revisions in the Ten Year Plan with respect to the Nicolet National Forest.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Forest County Board of Supervisors, That said Board strenuously objects to any land under Federal ownership being used for anything other than multiple use and management for timber production.

Be it further resolved, That a true and correct copy of this Resolution, upon its adoption, shall be forwarded by the County Clerk to appropriate representatives of the United States Forest Service so that Forest County's position on the matter can be made known.

RESOLUTION No. 41-2000

Whereas, the Nicolet and Chequamegon National Forests are two large public forests

of great interest and concern to the residents of northern Wisconsin, including those of Oneida County, and

Whereas, these Forests provide forest products, recreational opportunities, clean air and water, and scenic beauty to said residents, and

Whereas, the Nicolet and Chequamegon are currently going through a planning process which will dictate their future management policies and objectives, and

Whereas, there are several initiatives emanating from sources outside northern Wisconsin which are attempting to sway the planning process and thereby the future management of the forests to include large roadless areas and to eliminate commercial harvesting of forest products, and

Whereas, these proposals would negatively impact the economy of Northern Wisconsin and the ability of both the residents and visitors to Northern Wisconsin to travel through and enjoy these National Forests, and

Whereas, when the Federal government sought to purchase the lands for these forests in the early part of the 20th century it made an agreement with the local governments that these lands would provide stability for the local economy through sound resource management, and

Whereas, by locking up large areas of the forest and thereby curtailing the recreational potential and the production of forest products, this promise would be broken, and

Whereas, roadless areas also prevent the forest from being protected from the dangers of fire and large tracts of overmature timber are subject to disease and insect outbreaks, so

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Oneida County Board of Supervisors go on record in support of the production of forest products from the National Forests in a sustainable forestry initiative in conjunction with the concept of multiple use management, and

Be it further resolved, That the Oneida County Board of Supervisors go on record in opposition of roadless area initiatives which preclude citizens reasonable access to the recreational and aesthetic amenities of their forest, and

Be it further resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to United States Forest Service, U.S. Senator Herb Kohl, U.S. Senator Russ Feingold, U.S. Representative Dave Obey, U.S. Representative Mark Green, State Senator Roger Breske, State Representative Joe Handrick, State Representative Lorraine Seratti, Wisconsin D.N.R. Secretary George Meyer and the Wisconsin County Forests Association.

[From the Chequamegon Nicolet Chapter, Local 2165, National Federation of Federal Employees, International Assoc. of Machinists and Aerospace Workers]

ROADLESS INITIATIVE OPPOSITION

Chequamegon Nicolet National Forest employees ask that Wisconsin forests be excluded from the "Roadless Conservation" plan from Washington.

Employees say the Draft EIS is flawed, greatly underestimates detrimental economic impact and fails to specify any beneficial environmental impact.

Call Art Johnson at 715-762-5112 for more information.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest has only 5 miles of road building, but 55 miles of road obliteration per year.

Whereas, The Chequamegon-Nicolet road system has not been a major public concern on the Chequamegon-Nicolet.

Whereas, The Chequamegon-Nicolet wilderness areas are important, but are underutilized and make up only 1% of the recreational use of the Forests.

Whereas, The Chequamegon-Nicolet's recent Notice of Intent to revise the Management Plan did not identify roadless areas as a topic.

Whereas, The Draft EIS of the Proposed Roadless Conservation plan from Washington does not identify nor analyze beneficial or detrimental impacts on timber, economies, recreation, or ecosystem protection on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, as required by NEPA and 40 CFR 1500-08.

Whereas, The negative impact on timber sales will cause an estimated job loss of 75 local jobs per year and an economic loss of nearly \$75 million to Wisconsin's economy, the cumulative impacts will be much greater.

Whereas, The Union is concerned about the loss of jobs; and concerned about a lack of relevant, specific information in the Draft EIS;

Therefore, The Union suggests that the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest be eliminated from the proposed Roadless Conservation plan and that these issues be analyzed by the ongoing revision of the Forest Management Plan.

Passed unanimously at the May 18 membership meeting.

[From Forestry in Wisconsin—A New Outlook, Official Report of the Wisconsin Commercial Forestry Conference Held at Milwaukee, March 1928]

FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN WISCONSIN FORESTRY

(By L.F. Kneipp, Asst. Chief Forester, U.S.F.S., Washington, DC, 1928)

The present Federal forestry activities affecting Wisconsin consist of: Silvicultural Research (Lake States Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul) and Forest Products Research (Forest Products Laboratory, Madison). Taxation studies and co-operation in fire control, educational activities and planting is also being conducted. Establishment of a National Forest.

Establishment of a National Forest.—The redemption of the lost provinces of forestry, i.e. the 81 million acres of now unproductive lands, presents special and peculiar problems, for on these lands new forests, in large degree, must be built from the ground up by heavy initial investments which for long periods of time will produce little or no cash returns. To permit of Federal co-operation in this work of forest reclamation the Clarke-McNary Law provides that with the prior consent of the state, lands may be purchased by the Federal government and permanently administered as national forests. This provision is an extension of an elaboration of the so-called Weeks' Law under which the United States has purchased almost three million acres of land in the Appalachian chain from New Hampshire to Alabama.

The purpose of the United States in buying these lands is to restore them to a condition of maximum forest productivity by intensive management, planting, fire protection, etc.; to make them sources of permanent timber supply and bases for permanent wood-using industries and communities. As these processes go forward research and experimentation will develop and eventually the areas will be concrete demonstrations of the best principles and methods of forest manage-

ment and thus examples to other owners of forest lands. There is no selfish purpose in this proposal, no cleverly concealed invasion of state powers, but solely a desire to contribute toward the solution of a problem of national concern which in some states is so staggering in its proportions that the probable maximum effort by the states and its citizens will only partially alleviate the situation.

The field of Federal forest ownership is found in those parts of the lost provinces which offer little or no prospect of private action or of county or state action. If private initiative or county or state initiative is able adequately to cope with the situation, there is no need for Federal intervention. If, however, neither private, county, or state agencies are prepared to carry out the necessary and desirable steps then there is room for effective participation by the Federal government.

Wisconsin has its lost provinces of forestry in abundant measure. The estimated area of depleted and unproductive land seems to be not far from 10 million acres of which most is situated in a roughly triangular area based on the north boundary of the state and within which the acreage of improved farm land is at a minimum. There was a time when these lands supported a wealth of timber that was one of the glories of the state, but only pitiful remnants of that wealth remain today and little is being done to effectively replace it.

Nevertheless, these lands are a great potential source of wealth and social service. Their capacity to produce timber has been demonstrated and is unquestioned. They lie in relatively close proximity to what eventually will be probably the greatest timber consuming center of the nation. Developed as forests they will afford the means for outdoor recreation for which there will be increasing need as the population multiplies and the strains of modern existence increase. To the State of Wisconsin these lands are both a challenge and an opportunity.

Under the provisions of the Clarke-McNary Act a program of forest land purchases has been evolved which provides roughly for the acquisition of approximately two million, five hundred thousand acres in the states of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. The so-called Woodruff-McNary Bill, which has passed both houses of Congress and may by this time have become a law, establishes a fiscal policy for carrying out this program.

The act of consent of the State of Wisconsin establishes a maximum area of 500,000 acres and requires in addition the consent and concurrence not only of the Governor, the Director of the Conservation Commission, and the Commissioner of Public Lands, but that of the county commissioners of the counties in which purchases are to be made as well. The determination of the extent to which Federal ownership of forest lands would be desirable in Wisconsin rests therefore with the state and county officials.

Preliminary and rather superficial studies have shown that in Wisconsin there are at least six areas within the provisions and purposes of the Clarke-McNary Law could be made fully effective. These are as follows:

1. An area of approximately 200,000 acres in Forest, Oneida, and Vilas Counties of which part is on the drainage of the Wisconsin River and where white pine, hemlock, and hardwoods are important types.

2. An area of approximately 150,000 acres situated in the extreme northeast corner of Price County with possible minor extensions into Iron County or Oneida County. This

area is on the drainage of the Flambeau River and was at one time characterized by excellent stands of white pine, hemlock, and hardwoods.

3. An area of approximately 150,000 acres in Peshtigo and Oconto Counties principally of sandy plains type and supporting a typical pine stand.

4. An area of virtually denuded land, perhaps 100,000 acres in extent, situated in Bayfield County between Moqua and Iron River.

5. An area of approximately 100,000 acres situated in the eastern parts of Jackson and Monroe Counties. Primarily of the sandy plains type.

6. An area of approximately 150,000 acres lying diagonally across the southeastern corner of Douglas County and northwestern corner of Washburn County and the northeastern corner of Burnett County.

Only one of these areas has as yet been definitely proposed by the Federal government. That is the one in Forest, Oneida, and Vilas Counties and thus far the consent of Forest County has not been secured. As to the others, they are merely possibilities.

The foregoing sketches briefly the Federal forest policy as laid down in the Clarke-McNary Act and financed in the Woodruff-McNary Bill, and the possible applications of that policy in a co-operative private, State, and Federal effort to solve Wisconsin's idle land problem.

The Lake States Forest Experiment Station is the Federal Government's effort to create a body of dependable facts about the growing and utilization of timber crops. The Forest Service has already established 11 regional forest experiment stations, including the Lake States Station at St. Paul. The activities of the Station extend to Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota. Its task is not unlike that of agricultural experiment stations except that it deals with forest crops instead of agricultural crops. It carries on investigations into the nature of the different kinds of forests found in the region, their adaptability to certain soils, their growth and yield, and methods of securing their regrowth after cutting; it studies forest fires, their occurrences, causes and factors controlling their spread; it studies methods for planting up land that does not come up naturally to forest—from the collection of seed and raising forest nursery stock to planting out under conditions most adapted for the success of the plantations; it is co-operating with the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin, particularly in a thorough understanding of the forest fire situation in the state, and in determining the growth that takes place in the hardwood hemlock forests after selective logging.

The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, operated by the U.S. Forest Service in co-operation with the University of Wisconsin, is a national institution but is performing much research of direct importance to Wisconsin forestry. The Laboratory's function in a broad way is to so improve the processes of forest utilization that the full use-value of wood is realized. The three main phases of the Laboratory's research program consist in determining the physical and chemical properties of the many native species of woods, finding the requirements of various uses in terms of these wood properties, and adapting the one to the other as far as possible through scientific manipulation of growth and manufacturing processes. It is conducting experiments to develop better designs of wood products, better kiln drying and air seasoning methods, better pres-

ervative treatments, and better wood glues and fastenings; and it is carrying on studies to improve methods of manufacturing pulp and paper from wood and methods of logging, milling and lumber grading.

While the number of research units is nearly adequate, the present amount and stability of their appropriations is quite inadequate to deliver all the facts on which to build a complete forest policy. Hence the McSweeney-McNary Bill, now pending in Congress. This bill aims to do for forestry research what the Clarke-McNary Act is already doing for forest protection and administration, namely, to lay down an adequate program for the next ten years and to provide for its execution in co-operation with all agencies concerned.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE NICOLET NATIONAL FOREST

(By J. Terry Moore)

"National Forests exist today because the people want them. To make them accomplish the most good the people themselves must make clear how they want them run. Gifford Pinchot in Use of the National Forests. May 1907."

The birth of Wisconsin's first national forest was no easy task. The process required a lengthy series of approvals at the federal, state, and local levels before the purchase of land could even begin. One rejection could have derailed the process. This paper focuses on the events leading to the establishment of the original purchase unit that eventually became the Nicolet National Forest, with some attention given to the people who made things happen. The time period covered is from summer 1927 through the end of 1928. The sources of information are the files of The Rhinelander Daily News, The Forest County Republican, The Vilas County News Review, the records of Forest, Oneida, and Vilas counties, the Forest Service, and the Marathon County Historical Society, curators of the personal papers of J.D. Mylrea, President of the Thunder Lake Lumber Co.

Authority for establishing National Forests by purchase of land comes from the Act of March 1, 1911 commonly known as the Weeks Act. When passed the Weeks Act stated that no land could be purchased "until the legislature of the State in which the land lies shall have consented to the acquisition of such land by the United States for the purpose of preserving the navigability of navigable streams." This was known as enabling legislation and gave the states latitude to set conditions on the size or approval process for purchase areas. The Weeks Act was later modified by the passage of the Clark-McNary Act (June 7, 1924) which authorized purchase land for National Forests when such lands would promote a future timber supply. Citing the Clark-McNary authority, the Wisconsin legislature enacted legislation on June 26, 1925, empowering the United States to acquire land, not exceeding 100,000 acres, for the establishment of a national forest. The legislation required "that any tract or tracts so selected shall be first approved by the governor, the commissioners of public lands, and the conservation commissioner." In June of 1927 the state's legislation was amended authorizing an additional 400,000 acres of purchase bringing the total to 500,000 acres. Two additional changes were made. The original language requiring approval of each tract was changed by substituting the words "boundaries of any area so selected" for the statement "any tract or tracts so selected". A new requirement that any "areas so selected be approved by the

county boards of each of the counties in which lands were to be purchased", was added.

The Legislative actions by the Federal and State governments set the stage for the Forest Service to advance a proposal to establish a "purchase unit", the term applied to the areas selected and approved per the enabling legislation. According to an article in The Rhinelander Daily News, November 10, 1927, Colonel W.B. Greeley, then Chief of the Forest Service was in Madison to confer with L.B. Nagler, Wisconsin Conservation Director, on the proposal to establish a 500,000 acre purchase in Forest, Oneida, and Vilas counties. The articles also stated that representatives of the Forest Service would be contacting the three county boards to determine their position on the proposed purchase unit.

The November 11, 1927 issue of the Rhinelander Daily News contained an editorial reporting that the proposed purchase unit had received the full support of the Forest Service, the State Conservation Commission, and the Governor of Wisconsin. The editorial supported the proposal and urged the three county boards to approve the action during their annual meetings scheduled for the next week.

"If approved by the county boards, the action will be a long step forward in the reforestation program. The Federal government will buy worthless land, good only for forestry, from the present owners. When merchantable timber is produced, it will be cut and sold and a large part of the proceeds will be turned back to the town in which the land is located."

The editorial recognized one negative factor, that the land would not produce income while the forest was being restored but The Rhinelander Daily News did not view this as a valid objection, however, because the cut-over lands were going tax delinquent and the counties would lose revenue in either case.

On November 16, 1927, E.W. Tinker who was then a Forest Service lands assistant in the Denver, Region 2 office and Crosby Hoar of the Superior National Forest in Duluth, Minnesota arrived in Rhinelander to discuss the proposal with the Forests, Oneida, and Vilas County boards during their annual meetings. Tinker and Hoar appeared before the Oneida board in the morning and the Vilas board in the afternoon of the same day. Their reception was enthusiastic, and both boards quickly passed resolutions approving the purchase unit under a suspension of the normal rules of procedure. Later in the week Tinker and Hoar addressed the Forest County Board, but were not successful, as the Forest County Board tabled the motion for further consideration.

An editorial in the November 27, 1928, issue of The Rhinelander Daily News reported that Forest county withheld action on the proposed forest reserve on the advice of C.L. Harrington, Superintendent of Forestry of the State Conservation Commission. Harrington advised the board that approval of the federal proposal would remove lands from the tax base forever because the federal government had no funds to implement management on the acquired lands. Mr. Harrington also objected to the action on the basis that it would delegate to the federal government a program which belonged properly to the state. The editorial agreed in part that there would be a period of loss of income while the lands were restored, but strongly supported the action taken by the Oneida County Board. The editorial concluded with a request to Mr. Harrington "refrain from misleading the people of northern

Wisconsin who have an opportunity to get the cut-over lands back into their best use—forestry.”

An editorial in the November 29, 1927 issue of *The Rhinelander Daily News* states that the paper had received dispatches from Madison to the effect that the State Conservation Commission was heartily in favor of the proposed federal forest reserve. The editorial said that the message from Madison could “be interpreted in no other fashion than that which indicates the commission’s displeasure with the activities of C.L. Harrington in appearing before the Forest County Board.” The *Daily News* editorial also cited an editorial from the *Antigo Journal* which states:

“The *Antigo Journal* urges Forest county to convene in special session and cancel their former action and to act favorably on the matter. Langlade county will join in on the forest project when they are asked, but Langlade county had not been contacted by the forest service. The *Journal* supports the proposed forest based on future values of the land 25 to 30 years hence.”

In tabling the issue of a federal forest, the Forest County Board did not dismiss the idea out of hand. In later meetings they agreed to discuss the matter further at the February 1928 board meeting. That discussion resulted in two significant actions. First that the question of a federal forest would be put to a county wide referendum at the spring elections scheduled for April 3, 1928; and second that the county board would sponsor a public information meeting on the issue prior to the election.

The March 15, 1928 edition of *The Forest County Republican* reported the substance of the public meeting held March 14, 1928, at the Court House in Crandon, Wisconsin. Representing the Forest Service were L.A. Kneipp, Assistant Chief Forester from Washington, D.C., and E.W. Tinker from the Denver, Colorado Region 2 office, that at that time, had responsibility for Forest Service activities in the Lakes States area. The State of Wisconsin was represented by O.C. Lemke, Wausau, Wisconsin, a member of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission; Col. L.B. Nagler, Conservation Director, Madison, Wisconsin, and C.L. Harrington, Wisconsin Chief Forester, Madison, Wisconsin. Numerous county board officials were present as well as citizens from Antigo, Rhinelander, and Park Falls, Wisconsin. The article specifically notes that the representatives from Park Falls were present as part “of a move to get this proposed national forest established in Price county, in case the voters of Forest county turned down the proposition.”

At the completion of the public meeting the fate of the future Nicolet National Forest rested with the voters of Forest County. This position was highlighted in an editorial appearing in *The Forest Republican*, March 29, 1928.

“There are several counties in the state who only wish that the voters of Forest county will turn down the proposed proposition so that they will get a chance to secure this forest reserve for their county. The *Forest Republican* believes that if we turn it down and the reserve goes to some other county; we will regret it later when the benefits begin to accrue to the counties entertaining it.”

On April 3, 1928, the voters of Forest county approved the establishment of a purchase unit in Forest County. The referendum passed in all precincts in the county with the exception of the town of Alvin. At the May 2, 1928 county board meeting, the Forest

County Board voted unanimously to approve the federal forest reserve. The board approved a purchase unit as proposed, except it did not include any of the proposed purchase area within the town of Alvin. Forest County action led to establishment of a three county purchase unit encompassing approximately 148,480 acres within the boundary proposed by the Forest Service.

While Forest County action appeared to be the last approval required to advance the proposal to the National Forest Reservation Commission in Washington, D.C., for final approval, one more hurdle appeared at the last moment. The state’s legislation authorized the State Land Commission, composed of the state treasurer, secretary of state, and attorney general, to “sell and convey for a fair consideration to the United States any state land within such areas” (i.e. State School Trust Lands). An article in the May 17, 1928, *Rhinelander Daily News* reported that the State Land Commission had refused to approve the plan for national forest lands in Wisconsin. The article reported that the objection was based on a concern that some of the state lands secured loans to school districts in each of the counties. While the objection of the land commission was not reported as final, the delay was enough to prevent the proposed purchase unit from coming before the National Forest Reservation Commission’s May meeting. Since the National Forest Reservation Commission met only twice per year, in May and December, the last minute objection effectively delayed the proposal.

Six days later, *The Rhinelander Daily News* reported that the State Land Commission approved federal forest areas in Bayfield, Forest, Oneida, Price, and Vilas counties. The Land Commission adopted a position accepting the plan for federal forests, but specified that lands securing loans in the forest area would not be included in the transfer to the federal government. The *Daily News* report concluded with the statement that Colonel Nagler, director of conservation, telegraphed to the federal forest body that the land commission had approved the transfer.

On December 12, 1928, the National Forest Reservation Commission approved the establishment of the Oneida Purchase Unit, consisting of approximately 148,480 acres (or 232 square miles) in Forest, Oneida, and Vilas counties under authority of Section 6 of the Clark-McNary Act. The reasons for acquisition were stated as: “(a) Timber production; (b) determination and demonstration of best principles of forest management in the region; (c) stabilization of waterflow.”

My conclusions drawn from this history are that the Nicolet and Chequamegon National Forests exist in Wisconsin today because of the support of the people in the counties where the forests are located. Three factors influenced my findings: (1) The process for approval of the original purchase units placed the ultimate approval authority in the hands of local officials, i.e. the county boards; (2) While there was some opposition at the local level, the majority opinion not only endorsed the idea of national forests, but had counties actively competing for the opportunity to have portions of the authorized 500,000 acres of forest purchase located within their counties; (3) Local supporters were motivated by the belief that the long term economic gains that would result from the federal government’s acquisition, restoration, and management of the “cut-over” lands would exceed the short term losses of a reduced county tax base, or any of the al-

ternative management strategies then proposed for the cut-over lands.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 2000

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, my participation in the June 15th White House Strategy Session on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Students caused me to miss Rollcall votes 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290 and 291. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall #278, Providing for the consideration of H.R. 4635, Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, FY 2001—Nay.

Rollcall #279, Nethercutt (WA) Amendment to the Dicks Amendment that sought to strike reference to the planning and management of national monuments—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #280, Hansen of Utah Amendment to Dicks Amendment that sought to strike reference to the planning and management of national monuments—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #281, Dicks of Washington Amendment that exempts activities otherwise authorized by law to the planning and management of national monuments or activities related to the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan from any limitations imposed under the Act—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #282, Stearns of Florida Amendment (as modified) that sought to decrease National Endowment for the Arts funding by \$1.9 million or approximately 2% and increase wildlife fire management funding accordingly—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #283, Slaughter of New York Amendment that defers an additional \$22 million of prior year clean coal technology funding—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #284, Obey Motion that the Committee Rise—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #286, Sanders of Vermont Amendment No. 29 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that sought to make available \$10 million to establish a northeast home heating oil reserve and transfer strategic petroleum reserve funding for this purpose—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #287, Doggett motion that the Committee Rise—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #288, Nethercutt of Washington Amendment that implements the previously agreed to Dicks amendment except for activities related to planning and management of national monuments—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.